

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2489 OF 1995.

Coram: R.R.Jain, J.

-----

November 18, 1995.

Order:

The matter was called out in the morning. However, none remained present. Again the matter was called out at about 3.30 P.M. But, learned advocate for the petitioner is not present.

The short controversy raised in this petition is with regard to the date of appointment of respondent No.3. According to respondent No.3, her date of appointment is 1.7.1974 whereas the petitioner alleges to be 1.6.1982. The question involved appreciation of facts and the learned Tribunal has resolved this controversy by appreciating the material and factual aspect placed before it. In my view, this involves the question of appreciation of facts and the same cannot be looked into by this court while dealing with a petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Except this, I do not find any contention qua excess exercise of jurisdiction or non exercise of jurisdiction vested in the Tribunal. Hence the petition is rejected.

18.11.1995. (R.R.Jain, J.)